



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,326	12/12/2003	Sladjana Petrovic	47936-0010	9081
23577	7590	08/31/2010	EXAMINER	
RIDOUT & MAYBEE LLP 225 KING STREET WEST 10TH FLOOR TORONTO, ON M5V 3M2 CANADA			JOHNSON, CARLTON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2436	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/31/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/733,326	Applicant(s) PETROVIC, SLADJANA
Examiner CARLTON V. JOHNSON	Art Unit 2436

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6-16, 18-26 and 28-34.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Nasser Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

The amendments to Claims will be entered.

Examiner Position:

The arguments were not persuasive in overcoming the currently rejected claims.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant argues the 112 Rejection: The claim limitation states: "transmitting a redirect message to said browser, thereby redirecting said request to the second server". This claim limitation implies that a redirect request is redirected to another system. The initial request for this particular claim limitation is already a redirected request. There does not appear to be disclosure for a redirect request to be redirected a second time.

2. A 103 rejection based on multiple references is a legitimate technique according to the MPEP. The current application is rejected based on the Williams, Woods and LEVY prior art references. The set of references are in the same field of endeavor as the claimed invention, the secure transfer of session information. The 103 rejection allows portions of a claimed invention to come from different prior art references.

All references (Williams, Wood, and LEVY) disclose the transfer of session information such as identifiers, time/date information such as timestamps, and session state information between network-connected systems (servers, clients). A timestamp is a parameter available for transfer between systems in the management of session information.

3. Williams discloses redirecting a request to a second server or computer system. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session information) If the request is redirected between network-connected systems, then the request is transmitted from one system to another system. LEVY discloses the transfer a session ID and a data and time (a timestamp) parameter. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp); messages including record are sent between to server)

4. Woods specifically discloses a redirect response message transmitted in response to a redirect request. The redirect request and the initial request are not transmitted to the same destination. The specification does not disclose the transmission of a redirect request message to a browser but a request message is received and that particular request message is redirected to another server.

The specification discloses redirecting a request to another or a second server. The initial request is not a specific redirect request but a request message and that request message is redirected to another server.

5. Williams discloses the transfer of a timestamp parameter (within the token data structure) between two network-connected systems. (see Williams paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: token may include an optional timestamp)

Woods discloses the direct transfer of session state parameters such as a session ID parameter and a time/date parameter between network-connected entities. (see Wood paragraph [0050], lines 15-17: some parameters can be passed directly between systems) Williams and Woods disclose the transfer of a session ID and a timestamp parameter.

LEVY discloses the transfer of both a session ID parameter and a time and date or timestamp parameter between network-connected systems. (LEVY paragraph [0070], lines 3-9: record is created; record consists of session_id, date and time (timestamp))